

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/652,861	08/29/2003	Ulrich Busch	117163.00087	1001	
21324	7590 06/05/2006		EXAMINER		
HAHN LOI	HAHN LOESER & PARKS, LLP			FAULCON JR, LENWOOD	
One GOJO P	laza				
Suite 300			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
AKRON, O	H 44311-1076		3762		
			DATE MAIL ED: 06/05/2000	<i>c</i>	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Q	γ^{2}
ď	Į

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/652,861	BUSCH ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Lenwood Faulcon, Jr.	3762			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR F WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILII - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 of after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory. Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	NG DATE OF THIS COMMUNIC CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a re- ion. period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON's statute, cause the application to become AB.	CATION. cply be timely filed ITHS from the mailing date of this communicatio ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	29 August 2003.				
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) ⊠ This action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits					
closed in accordance with the practice ur	nder <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D	. 11, 453 O.G. 213.			
Disposition of Claims					
4)	thdrawn from consideration.				
Application Papers					
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Example 10) ☑ The drawing(s) filed on 12 April 2004 is/al Applicant may not request that any objection Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the specific or the specific o	re: a)⊠ accepted or b)⊡ object to the drawing(s) be held in abeyan correction is required if the drawing(ce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121((d).		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docu 2. Certified copies of the priority docu 3. Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International E * See the attached detailed Office action for	uments have been received. uments have been received in A e priority documents have been Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	pplication No received in this National Stage			
Attachment(s)					
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-93) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/Paper No(s)/Mail Date 4/12/2004. 	48) Paper No(s	ummary (PTO-413))/Mail Date Iformal Patent Application (PTO-152) 			

Application/Control Number: 10/652,861 Page 2

Art Unit: 3762

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

- 2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:
 - The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.
- 3. Claims 3 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Examiner is of the opinion that the "further sensing unit" limitation does not have support in the specification.
- 4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

 The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 5. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Examiner takes the position that the phrase "at the same time a time interval from the last occurrence of the ventricular event ascertained outside a crosstalk window, to the next possible ventricular stimulation event," is not clear as to whether it is meant to include an additional time interval, an overlapping time interval or

Application/Control Number: 10/652,861 Page 3

Art Unit: 3762

some other type of time interval; however, Examiner interprets this phrase to be providing an additional condition which must be met for suppressing a stimulation pulse to the second atrium.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 7. The following rejections are based on prior art, which can be applied to the claims as to the best of the understanding of the Examiner.

Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Limousin (U.S. Patent No. 5,514,161).

In regards to claims 1 and 2, Examiner is interpreting both a "sensing unit" and "stimulation unit" to be electrodes, or in the alternative the circuitry required to perform sensing and stimulation. Limousin teaches of a double atrial triple chamber cardiac pacemaker, comprising at least one sensing unit for sensing events of a first atrium and a first ventricle (see for example col. 3 lines 50-53), at least one stimulation unit that is adapted to produce stimulation pulses to a second atrium (see for example col. 2 lines 37-43 and the first ventricle (see for example col. 2 lines 37-43), a control unit (col. 3 lines 17-27). Examiner takes the position that it is inherent in the system as taught by Limousin to provide ventricular stimulation pulse in the absence of sensed ventricular event after an atrial sensed event triggers a ventricular escape interval (see for example

Application/Control Number: 10/652,861

Art Unit: 3762

col. 4 lines 38-49), since this is the reason for providing ventricular stimulation (see for example col. 4 lines 5-7), or in the alternative it is well known in the art to stimulate the ventricle in the absence of sensed ventricular event at the conclusion ventricular escape interval, and it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to modify the system as taught by Limousin to provide ventricular stimulation under such conditions. Examiner also takes the position that Limousin teaches of stimulating a second atrium in regards to interatrial conduction time (16) if the stimulation pulse is not inhibited (see for example col. 6 lines 4-13).

Further in regards to claims 1 and 2, Examiner takes the position that Limousin teaches that the delivery of a stimulation pulse to a second atrium is suppressed if a ventricular sensed event occurs in a crosstalk/listening window (see for example col. 5 lines 61-67 and col. 6 lines 1-4), and if the time between the previous ventricular event that occurred outside of the listening window and the time of the next possible ventricular event can be measured by the system and determined to be greater than what would be expected for an acceptable time period/interval (col. 6 lines 17-20), similarly to the process Limousin teaches of for measurements of sensed atrial signals (see for example col. 5 lines 40-60). Or in the alternative, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the system as taught by Limousin to include a timing of an interval between such ventricular events and comparing it to a predetermine value/interval.

Further regarding claim 2, Limousin teaches of suppressing the delivery of a stimulation pulse to the second atrium (see for example col. 5 lines 61-67 and col. 6

Art Unit: 3762

lines 1-4) and inherently has the ability to do so when the system is working the maximum stimulation rate, since there no is teaching that it is not capable of doing such.

In regards to claims 3 and 7, again Examiner interprets "sensing unit" to be an electrode or the circuitry required for sensing. Limousin teaches of sensing in the right atrium (col. 3 lines 53-63), which Examiner interprets broadly to include a separate sensing unit. Or in the alternative, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide a separate (multiple sensing units), since it has been held that mere duplication of the essential working parts of a device involves only routine skill in the art. St Regis Paper Co. v. Bemis Co., 193 USPQ 8. Further, in regards to claims 3 and 7, Examiner takes the position that the Limousin system is capable of suppressing the stimulation of the second atrium in light of a signal which is characteristic of a left atrial sensed event (see for example col. 3 lines 53-63), or in the alternative, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the system as taught by Limousin to suppress the stimulation of the second atrium in light of left atrial sensed event (see for example col. col. 3 lines 63-67 and col. 4 lines 1-5.

In regards to claims 4-6 and 8-16, Examiner take the position that Limousin system teaches of calculating the time spacing between a ventricular event and a planned ventricular stimulation, and further comparing the calculated timed spacing to a predetermined value (see for example col. 6 lines 17-20 and col. 5 lines 40-60). Or in the alternative, the calculating of a interval between ventricular events and further comparing the events to a predetermined time is well know in the art and would have

Art Unit: 3762

been an obvious modification to the Limousin system to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Mann et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,825,870), Thompson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,902,324), Rajasekhar et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,249,701), Stahmann et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,553,258), Stahmann et al. (U.S. 2002/0082653), Struble (U.S. 2002/0183792), Rouw et al. (U.S. 2002/0183795), Stahmann et al. (U.S. 2003/0199931).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lenwood Faulcon, Jr. whose telephone number is 571-272-6090. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 9 to 5 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Angela D. Sykes, can be reached on 571-272-4955. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

Application/Control Number: 10/652,861

Art Unit: 3762

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Lenwood Faulcon, Jr.

George Manuel

Page 7

Primary Examiner